

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The present application includes pending claims 1-42, all of which have been rejected. By this Amendment, claims 3, 9, 11-14, 16-17, 19-21, 23, 25, 27-29, and 32-41 have been amended, as set forth above, to further clarify the language used in these claims and to further prosecution of the present application. The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Initially, the Applicant notes that a goal of patent examination is to provide a prompt and complete examination of a patent application.

It is essential that patent applicants obtain a prompt yet complete examination of their applications. Under the principles of compact prosecution, each claim should be reviewed for compliance with every statutory requirement for patentability in the *initial review* of the application, even if one or more claims are found to be deficient with respect to some statutory requirement. Thus, Office personnel *should* state *all* reasons and bases for rejecting claims in the *first* Office action. Deficiencies should be explained clearly, particularly when they serve as a basis for a rejection. Whenever practicable, Office personnel should indicate how rejections may be overcome and how problems may be resolved. A failure to follow this approach can lead to unnecessary delays in the prosecution of the application.

See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2106(II). As such, the Applicant assumes, based on the goals of patent examination noted above, that the present Office Action has set forth “all reasons and bases” for rejecting the claims.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 8-11, 14-15, 19-20 and 31-42 stand rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Publication No. 2002/0059651, issued to Hirata, et al. (hereinafter, Hirata). Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirata, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,493, issued to Dorenbosch, et al. (hereinafter, Dorenbosch). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirata, in view of Dorenbosch, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,384,847, issued to Hendrickson, et al. (hereinafter, Hendrickson). Claims 12, 13, 16-18, 21-27 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirata in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,445,907, issued to Middeke, et al. (hereinafter, Middeke). Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirata, in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0024962, issued to Bauer (hereinafter, Bauer). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections at least for the reasons previously set forth during prosecution and at least based on the following remarks.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

I. Hirata Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 2, 3, 8-11, 14, 15, 19-20, and 31-42

The Applicant first turns to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 8-11, 14, 15, 19-20, and 31-42 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hirata. With regard to the anticipation rejections under 102(b), MPEP 2131 states that “[a] claim is

anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) at 2131 (internal citation omitted). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” See *id.* (internal citation omitted).

Hirata discloses a multi-broadcast receiving and distributing device that comprises “a plurality of receivers #1, #2 and #3 each of which has a receiving portion for receiving and extracting inherent carrier signals and a signal converting portion for converting the carrier signals into common signal type baseband signals respectively, and a device body having a plurality of spaces for accommodating the receivers #1, #2 and #3 respectively and outputting the baseband signals therefrom.” See Hirata at Abstract.

A. Rejection of Independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 102(e), the Applicant submits that Hirata does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “a single integrated circuit chip comprising a first satellite receiver demodulator integrated within said single integrated circuit chip and at least a second satellite receiver demodulator integrated within said single integrated circuit chip,” as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1. The Examiner states the following

in the Office Action:

As to claims 1, 31, 42, Hirata teaches a system for an integrated set-top box, the system comprising: a single integrated circuit chip comprising: a first satellite receiver demodulator (see fig. 2b, 2a, 3a, paragraphs 0060-0062) integrated within the single integrated circuit chip; at least a second satellite receiver demodulator (see fig. 2b, 2b, 3b, paragraphs 0060-0062) integrated within the single integrated circuit chip; and at least one processor (see fig. 2b, 4, paragraphs 0060-0062) integrated within the single integrated circuit chip and coupled to the first satellite receiver demodulator and the second satellite receiver demodulator.

See the Office Action at page 2. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the above argument, which relies on Figure 2B and paragraphs 0060-0062 of Hirata. The Applicant points out that the multi-broadcast and distribution device 100 of Hirata comprises a device body 10 and one or more separate receivers 2a, 2b, and/or 2c. See Hirata at ¶ 0064. Furthermore, Hirata discloses that the multi-broadcast and distribution device 100 comprises receiver accommodating spaces (compartments) 3a, 3b, and 3c, where a user can insert one or more of the separate receivers 2a, 2b, and 2c, respectively. In other words, the device body 10 of the multi-broadcast and distribution device 100 comprises three openings (3a, 3b, 3c) where separate receiver devices (2a, 2b, 2c) may be inserted by a user. See *id.* at ¶ 0066. Therefore, *none of the receiver devices (2a, 2b, 2c) disclosed by Hirata are integrated within a single integrated circuit chip*, as claimed by the Applicant in claim 1.

The Examiner is further referred to the following citation in Hirata:

A user selects a preferred broadcasting company from a group of broadcast companies 1 shown in FIG. 2, installs an antenna or an outdoor cable for receiving the broadcast signals provided by the selected broadcasting company and purchases or rents a receiver specified by the broadcasting company. When the user selected a plurality of broadcasting companies, the user purchases or leases specified receiver for each of the selected companies, the user disposes the receivers #1 (2a), #2 (2b) and #3 (2c) in the spaces (compartments) #1 (3a), #2 (3b) and #3 (3c) of the receiver accommodating portion 3 of the multi-broadcast receiving and distributing device body 10. (emphasis added)

See id. In this regard, Hirata teaches that the user selects one or more preferred broadcasting companies and then the user purchases or leases the receiver for each of the broadcasting companies that the user has previously selected. Consequently, *Hirata clearly teaches away from implementing the multi-broadcast and distribution device 100 as a single integrated circuit chip comprising a plurality of satellite receiver demodulators*, since the device body 10 and each of the receivers 2a, 2b, and 2c, which may be associated with different broadcasting companies, are completely separate devices and are not (and, as described by Hirata, cannot be) implemented as a single integrated circuit. Therefore, Hirata does not disclose or suggest a single integrated circuit chip that comprises a first and a second satellite receiver demodulator integrated within the single circuit chip, as claimed by the Applicant in claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Hirata and is allowable. Independent claim 31 is similar in many respects to the system disclosed in independent claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant submits that

independent claim 31 is also allowable over the references cited in the Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 2, 3, 8-11, 14, 15, 19-21, and 32-42

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hirata has been overcome and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 2, 3, 8-11, 14, 15, 19-20, and 32-42 depend from independent claims 1 and 31, respectively, and are, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 1-2, 3, 8-11, 14, 15, 19-20, and 31-42.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 4-7, 12-13, 16-18, and 21-30

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hirata has been overcome and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, since the additional cited references (Dorenbosch, Hendrickson,

Middeke, and Bauer) do not overcome the deficiencies of Hirata, claims 4-7, 12-13, 16-18, and 21-30 depend from independent claim 1, and are, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 4-7, 12-13, 16-18, and 21-30.

Application No. 10/716,065
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2006

CONCLUSION


Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees, the Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview, and request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned Attorney at (312) 775-8176.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

A Notice of Allowability is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 03-NOV-2006


Ognyan Beremski, Esq.
Registration No. 51,458
Attorney for Applicant

MCANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 WEST MADISON STREET, 34TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60661
(312) 775-8000

/ OIB